

Vol. 14 No 1 January 1989

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool  
 by Dr J.Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA  
 Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,  
 P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX,  
 RATES for 1989, 10 issues (not August and September)  
 SURFACE £9.50 UK, £10.50 Europe, \$(US)18.50 elsewhere  
 AIR £11 Europe, \$(US)27.50 N.America, \$(US)35 Australasia.



CONTENTS of which the authors retain the copyright.

The editor retains copyright in the format.

### Correspondence & Corrigenda

**A.S.Hollis** (Keble College, Oxford): *Ovid, Heroides 10.127-30*

2-3

**A. W.J. Holleman** (Voorburg, Netherlands): *Virgil and the Etruscans.*

4

**B.Boyaval** (Lille): *P.IFAO II,1.*

4-7

**J.A.Barsby** (Otago): *Terence and the shipwrecked lover.*

7-9

Review **C.J.Tuplin** (Liverpool):

9-10

Russell Meiggs & David Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century B.C.*, revised edition, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988. Pp.xx + 317. Cloth, £35. ISBN 0 19 8142668.

11-12

Review **Elizabeth Henry** (Blackburn)

12-13

*L.Annaei Senecae Tragoediae* ed. O.Zweierlein. Oxford Classical Texts, 1986. Pp.xxiv +483. Cloth, £18.95. ISBN 0 19 814657 4

Review Discussion **J.N.Adams** (Manchester)

14-16

Roger Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance*, ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 8, Liverpool 1982. Pp.xii+322. £25 ISBN 0-905205-12-X.

The Editor persistently neglects one of the axioms of that collection sometimes improperly and euphemistically attributed to one whose name implies an ethnic slur, but better known to him from his days in the RAF as Sod's Laws: that is, that it always takes longer than you think it will. So it is not with 'this number of *LCM*' that it gets back on course, and the Editor had better stop making promises or expressing hopes that may so easily be broken or dashed by the operation of that law. But its appearing has been expedited by the use of articles submitted on disc (he should add that those who send IBM or IBM clone discs should take care that they are 360K and not double density, as *LCM* has not yet the hardware that can read the latter) and by postponing the Editor's Book Notes to – he had better say – another number.

One of the activities that took out two days that might otherwise have been devoted to *LCM* was attendance at the CUCD Conference at King's College Cambridge, which he in no way regrets, not least because enabled him to melt the slight *froideur* between him and that organization and its Chairman which readers may have detected in some of these notes. The Conference was not as well attended as the last, a combination perhaps of its cost and the fact that Universities and Departments are no longer as able or willing to pay for attendance as they were, and the Editor, perhaps having become more sybaritic than in his undergraduate days (though the Keynes building has *en suite* bathrooms, even if the undergraduates are only up for eight weeks), wonders if the facilities of an hotel in the Metropolis are not becoming the best option for conferences.

His attendance was, however, well worthwhile. Business men and politicians who addressed the conference were all very sympathetic to classics and regarded it as an education that did not simply teach to despise the money it prevented from earning. But sympathy was all they had to offer, though the Editor's wellknown habit of reading old numbers of journals has this

day provided him with some apposite quotations: 'In the present climate of officially encouraged mendicancy, under a government determined to force universities into an increasing reliance on external sources of funding, it is perhaps timely to look into a little-known but classic instance of the perils inherent in sponsored scholarship', the first words of Richard Clogg's article on 'the imbroglio that developed over Arnold Toynbee's tenure of the Koraes chair at King's College, London during the early 1920s', and 'Moreover, at a time when the spirit of Gradgrind lies heavily over the universities, the Toynbee imbroglio is a salutary reminder of the fact that, even if he who pays the piper does not always call the tune, he all too frequently tries to' (TLS 14.2.86, 164 & 175). The last words of course also explain the current government attitude as having been implicit from the very beginning of government financing of the universities.

Both businessmen and politicians therefore told us we must work out our own salvation, and they were much less interested in the Universities than in the schools: that was, they suggested, the market-place in which we must sell ourselves to parents, in order to ensure the supply of students who alone will justify our establishment, in universities where the FTE (full time equivalent student) reigns supreme. The three academic speakers, were each, in their way, concerned about the financing of academic activities. Dr Parsons was properly concerned about the supply of papyrologists, in a field of academic importance but not career or employment oriented, Professor Cairns about what he described as an Indian summer of academic publishing (from which the Editor inferred that we must all learn to pay more for our books), and Professor Warren for the future of the British Schools in Rome, Athens, Ankara etc., which might be thought to have a diplomatic as well as an academic dimension, though neither seems to appeal to our masters.

The Editor has before now adverted upon a dichotomy between communication and scholarship, and evinced concern about what he now thinks is dilution, the concentration upon courses in Classical Studies, History and Archaeology with at most three years of language from scratch, the courses which bring in the students and will increasingly do so if or as language disappears from the schools. Not of course that the motivated student should not be capable of a course firmly based on the language even if only started at University, and there are colleagues in post who demonstrate the possibility. But he is concerned at what used to be called the problem of small departments, the apparently necessary link between students and subject. His earlier advocacy of a small number of big departments was in part intended to deal with this problem, but at the conference he enunciated in true dinosauric fashion the doctrine that an enlightened government should be happy to regard the encouragement and support of scholarship as both a pleasure and a duty, but he fears that the politicians were not impressed.

*minuitur populi luctus* (Festus p.154M = 144L), which was sadly increased by the untimely deaths of Elizabeth Rawson and James Holladay, by the announcement in the New Year Honours of a knighthood for John Boardman, Lincoln Professor of Classical Archaeology and Art in the University of Oxford, (*privatis autem . . . cum honos in familia venit*): it increases the pleasure to know that his predecessor in the chair had been similarly honoured, and the Editor trusts that he may offer to Sir John the congratulations not only of himself and the Editorial Assistant but also those of all subscribers and readers of LCM.



### Correspondence

from John Ferguson, MA, BD, FIAL, Hon D.Univ., 102 Oakfield Road, Selly Park,  
Birmingham B29 7ED

28.1.89

Sir,

An appendix to the discussion of great learning in Greek.

C.F.Angus, Fellow and Vice-Master of Trinity Hall, told me once that he had read everything written in Greek up to A.D. 1000. There cannot be many who could claim that. He

said that he used to make notes in Greek as he read, and found that he was writing Aristotelian Greek, which convinced him that our surviving Aristotle consists of lecture-notes. He published little (a chapter on Stoicism and Epicureanism in *CAH*). He was an admirable lecturer, clear and witty, an insomniac who never lectured before 12, and a brilliant supervisor. I was fortunate to go to him from another college for Aristotle unseens, and can testify to his precise and exacting knowledge of Greek. But he was also a fascinating talker about life, and I gained from that. His room was lined with books. He loved to tell how Tagore, whom he had known in India, visited him in Cambridge, halted in the doorway and said in his reedy voice "You have a great many books here. Do you ever get time to think?"

Yours etc.,

John Ferguson.

from Dr D.P.Fowler, Jesus College, Oxford, OX1 3DW.

13 Jan 1989

Sir,

Niall W.Slater (*LCM* 13 9/10 [Nov/Dec 1988], 147-8) attempts to use Aristophanes *Ach.* 418-19 to date Euripides' *Oeneus*: he thinks that *ἡγωνίζετο* must refer to the actors' contest rather than to the poets', and rules out Starkie's conception that *Οἰνεύς* refers to the whole play. He has missed, however, Colin Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford 1983), 47-8, who takes Starkie's idea further and to my mind shows conclusively that there is play in this scene on the costumes as book-rolls. Whether or not Slater would agree, however, those disposed to use his argument for dating the *Oeneus* should take Macleod into account.

Yours etc.,

Don Fowler

from Mr A.J.Barron, Ilfracombe, Devon

18 Jan 1989

Sir,

One point early in B.L.Arkins' review of Professor J.Ferguson on Catullus (*LCM* 13 9/10 [Nov/Dec 1988], 147-8), prompts these lines.

Bergk's restoration at the end of Poem 1, to read *qualecunque quidem est, patroni ut ergo*, does not depend upon proof that Catullus was a (technical) *cliens* of Cornelius Nepos. A glance in *OLD* shows, in this case correctly, that the word *patronus* is used in various senses and contexts, some quite loose (as I'd in any case assume for Catullus). Poem 49 is addressed to Cicero, just as Poem 1 is addressed to Nepos, a mutual friend, and any overtone of *patronus* at its end (49.7) refers to Cicero's skill as an advocate. The two poems have, in pattern and in Catullus' self-disparagement, much in common.

Martial's epitaph on Erotion (5.34) commends her to the protection of *patroni* in the other world, where I assume he envisages all the spirits welcoming her.

Any looseness of word usage invites word play, and Catullus, if anyone, is entitled to parody the seriousness of later poets addressing a 'technical' *patronus*.

Yours etc.,

A.J.Barron.

**Corrigenda** to *LCM* 13.8 (Oct.1988), Bicknell on Ephialtes, p.114, penultimate paragraph, the play of Cratinus is the *Eunidae*, and Ephialtes of course lingered on **after** not 'before being struck down'. On p.115, at the end of the article, Menon's archon year is 473/2.

And in *LCM* 13.9/10 (Nov./Dec.1988), p.150, Arkins on Ferguson on Catullus, the Editor invented an unhappy love affair between Ariadne and Thetis in place of that between Ariadne and Theseus.

*I am grateful for comments to Professors E.J.Kenney and R.G.M.Nisbet, and also to Mr P.A.M.Thompson of Keble College, Oxford, who is writing a thesis on Heroides 20 and 21.*

In the 1971 edition of H.Dörrie lines 127-30 appear as follows (the lack of punctuation after 128 may be inadvertent): *maceror interdum, quod sim tibi causa dolendi,*

*teque mea laedi calliditate puto  
inque caput nostrum dominae periuria, quaeso,  
eveniant; poena tuta sit illa mea! 130  
ne tamen ignorem, quid agas etc.*

The couplet 129-130 causes several problems. First of all, *-que* (129) is unwelcome. Palmer accepted Ehwald's *in caput ut*, which is of course palaeographically very easy, but elsewhere in Ovid *quaeso* is always parenthetical – in early Latin (e.g. Plautus, *Men.* 1073 *quaeso ignoscas*) and Cicero (e.g. *ad Att.* 7.14.3 *quaeso videas*) the verb may take a direct subjunctive, so that, if there were no other difficulties, one might consider simply removing the commas around *quaeso* in this line of Ovid. Another oddity is the switch from second person (*tibi* 127, *te* 128) to third (*illa* 130) and then back to second (*agas* 131); although writers in the *Heroides* occasionally refer to addressees in the third person (e.g. 7.26-36, 9.33-6), there seems no special reason for Acontius to do so here. Finally, a wish for punishment to fall upon himself does not fit Acontius' ruthless strategy of piling all the guilt upon Cydippe.

I suggest emending *quaeso* to *clamo* in 129, and punctuating as follows:

*'in' que 'caput nostrum dominae periuria' clamo  
eveniant; poena tuta sit illa mea!'*

The awkward *-que* is then dealt with in a very Ovidian way, and the switch from second to third person accounted for. Also the text seems more lively, and the argument improved. *clamo*, which Ovid likes to couple with direct speech (e.g. *Met.* 9.120-21 *'quo te fiducia' clamat* | *'vana pedum, violente, rapit?'*) would then be on a level with the verbs *maceror* (127) and *puto* (128), describing how Acontius feels 'from time to time' (*interdum*); but he is shown up as a hypocrite, since these feelings have absolutely no effect on his course of action.

There is another reason why *clamo* with direct speech is appropriate here: it would remind readers of Acontius' remorseful soliloquy in the countryside in Callimachus (cf. especially fr.74Pf. *ἄρ' ἔγω, τί δέ μοι τόνδ' ἐπέθηκα φόβον;*). This soliloquy – and any sign of remorse from Acontius – is virtually confined by Ovid to the four lines 127-130. To judge from Aristaenetus 1.10.69-70 *Μαζαλ οὐ γάρ, ἀλλὰ τὸν δόντα τῇ ἐπιτοκίᾳ τὴν πρόφασιν κολαστέον*, Acontius in Callimachus' soliloquy wished that the punishment for perjury might fall on himself (the parallel noted by A.Dietzler, *Die Akontios-Elegie des Kallimachos* [1933], p.31). Ovid cleverly recalls this, while at the same time suggesting the insincerity of *his* Acontius.

Of course *quaeso* to *clamo* is quite a change, but a failure to recognize that we have here an inset quotation might cause puzzlement and lead to deliberate alteration. At any rate I hope that the final result is better and more Ovidian.

Copyright © 1989 A.S.Hollis

A. W.J.Holleman (Voorburg, Netherlands): *Virgil and the Etruscans* LCM 14.1 (Jan.1989), 4-7

In *RMitt* 66 (1959), 65-96, Ragna Enking advocated the view that Virgil was an Etruscan. Her article is entitled '*P. Vergilius Maro, vates Etruscus*', after Virgil's biographer Phocas, who first called Virgil so. Also the *Vita Noricensis* calls Virgil *genere Tusco*. Pliny, *Nat.Hist.* III 19.130, states that up to his own time Mantua – practically Virgil's birthplace – had remained Etruscan.

It is a widespread misunderstanding that during the Roman conquest of Italy, and particularly by the actions of Sulla, the Etruscan nation had become extinct. To be sure, at the time of Virgil the usage of the Etruscan language had almost disappeared, officially that is, but that is not to say that Etruscan civilization and life-style had died out. If Horace, *Odes* III.10 (11-12), in an elegant litotes (*non te Penelopen* etc.) could picture the married Etruscan lady Lyce, i.e. Lupa, as a trollop, it means that Etruscan ladies were still considered to behave as sexually freely as Theopompus pictured them in the 4th century. The story of Urgulania, the friend of the empress Livia, tells us that 'she practised a strict endogamy within the Etruscan aristocracy' (J.Huergon, *The Daily Life of the Etruscans*, London 1964, Ch.4). Huergon thinks that she tolerated only one exception: in accepting the future emperor Claudius as husband for her granddaughter Urgulanilla. But, as I pointed out (*Hist.* 33 [1984], 504-8, 35 [1986], 377), the Claudians were of Etruscan descent, and so Urgulania seems to have tolerated not a single exception to her rule in this respect. Etruscan civilization did not die out with the official usage of the Etruscan language (and I stress the word *official*).

As regards Virgil, who apparently (*Aen.* 10 198sq.) was not a little proud of Mantua, M.Grant also concluded that: 'In other words, Virgil may well have been an Etruscan' (*Roman Myths*, rev. edn. Harmondsworth 1973, 84). He sensed that the poet was interested in the Etruscan part in Rome's foundation (81). At any rate, with the exception of Mezentius, the *contemptor divom*, no bad feelings against any Etruscan are shown by the poet. On the contrary, a number of Etruscan allies of Aeneas come to the fore. Virgil devotes an extra invocation of the Muses to this important event: 10 163sq repeating 7 641

*pandite nunc Helicon, deae, cantusque movete,  
quae manus interea Tuscis comitetur ab oris  
Aenean armetque rates pelagoque vehatur.*

We may well, therefore, scrutinize the following passage, 10 165-184, the first word of which is the name of Massicus. Paul Lejay (ed. Hachette) notes: '*nom tiré de la géographie*', and elsewhere: '*Virgile aime à donner à ses héros des noms géographiques*'. Massicus was indeed the name of a mountain where they produced a very good wine (praised by Horace, e.g. *Odes* 1 i.19). This habit of the poet turns out to be an Etruscan one: thus the town of Tarquinia was named after its founder Tarchon, and likewise the name of Rome is generally linked to the Rumlo-family. In line 172 we read *Populonia mater*. Lejay notes: '*mater = patria*'. The usage of 'motherland' instead of 'fatherland' is both un-Roman and un-Greek. Plato (*Resp.* 575d) mentions it as characteristic of the people of Crete: *φλήν μητρίδα, Κρήτες φασι*. But then, we remember, particularly from the excavations, the high position of women in Minoan civilization and its 'feminine radiation'. N.Platon, *Kreta* (Archaeologia Mundi, München<sup>3</sup> 1968), 146: '*Auf allen Gebieten lässt sich die bedeutende Rolle, die die Frauen gespielt haben, durchschauen; man zweifelt daher heute nicht mehr daran, dass die Ausübung der Kunst zu einem grossen Teil in den Händen der Frauen lag, oder wenigstens durch ihre Empfindung gelenkt wurde*'. Also in Etruscan art woman is emphatically in attendance. So *Populonia mater* is just another testimony to Virgil's Etruscan background.

The Etruscan interest in Aeneas is an established fact, notwithstanding all bickering on the meaning and dating of the archaeological evidence<sup>1</sup>. Of course, in Etruria proper the Aeneas legend was well-known before it reached (Etruscan) Rome<sup>2</sup>. Grant (80): 'there was a

<sup>1</sup> T.J.Cornell, 'Aeneas' arrival in Italy', *LCM* 2.4 (Apr.1977), 77-83. He states that the number of 58 vases 'has no statistical significance in relation to the total number of Greek vases found in Etruria', as though all ancient Etruria has been excavated and nothing new could be found. J.Poucet, '*Enée et Lavinium*', *RBPhH* 61 (1983), 144-59.

<sup>2</sup> Wrongly, I think, does one speak of 'pre-Etruscan Rome'. Naturally there is a pre-Etruscan layer of the site, but that layer cannot be called Roman. After the departure of the Etruscans (not all of them) Roman tradition makers invented that 'pre-Etruscan Rome' in order to present the Etruscan monarchy as being only an intermezzo in Roman history: see A.J.Pfiffig, *Einführung in die Etruskologie*, Darmstadt<sup>2</sup> 1984, 42-43. Müller & Deecke, *Die Etrusker*, recognized the oldest polity of Rome, attributed to Romulus (*tribus, curiae*, etc.) as purely Etruscan; as they believed in a pre-Etruscan Rome they consequently, and rightly, concluded that that polity dated from the time of the Etruscan monarchy (Vol.1, 355-58).

sudden and strong interest in c.525-470 . . . Why there was such a strong effervescence of interest at this particular time we cannot yet say; perhaps future researchers will throw some light on the question'. K.Schauenburg (*Gymnas.* 67 [1960], 189) relates the phenomenon to the 'wachsende Feindschaft gegenüber den Griechen'. But, first, why did Greek vase-painters join in producing the theme of Aeneas carrying his old father? Secondly, was Aeneas, apart from being a Trojan, considered as a Greek-hater?

The period mentioned both by Grant and Schauenburg reminds me rather of the intimate relations which existed between Etruscan cities (especially Caere) and Carthage. Aristotle (*Pol.* III 9 1280a34-38) therefore called the Etruscans and Carthaginians almost citizens of one and the same state: *ὡς μᾶς ἄν πολῖται πόλεως ἦσαν*. About 500 B.C. the 'king' (MLK) of Caere even built a small sanctuary for the Carthaginian goddess Astarte and identified her with the Etruscan goddess Uni (Juno); see M.Finley, *Aspects of Antiquity* (1972), 110ff. and my note in *CEDAC Carthage Bull.* 6 (1985), 40-42: 'Astarté à Pyrgi'. T.J.Cornell must, therefore, have gone astray (*LCM* 2.4 [Apr.1977], 77-83: 'Aeneas' arrival in Italy') in supporting the view (J.Perret) that it was not until 'in the course of the third century B.C.' that Rome learned about Aeneas. Certainly he overlooked the tradition that Pyrrhus in 281 B.C. considered the Trojan ancestry of Rome as a cogent reason for coming to the rescue of the Tarentines (Paus.1.12.1). By then the Aeneas legend was well established at Rome and firmly abroad (an embarrassing point already for Perret; see G.K.Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, Princeton 1969, 170-72). We may state that 525 B.C. is the *terminus ante quem* Aeneas was accepted as having landed in Central Italy. The Etruscans considered themselves as immigrants from Asia Minor. Accordingly, also for Virgil *Lyd(i)us* stands for *Etruscus*: *Aen.* 2 781-2; 9 11. Several Etruscan cities venerated Aeneas as their founder, or at least as an ancestor or hero (Galinsky, 131).

In view of Virgil's Etruscan background we may presume that he had knowledge of Etruscan traditions about Aeneas (Maecenas may have lent a helping hand). If so, those traditions may well have concerned Dido too. For though the Virgilian Dido is now considered as being a creation of Virgil himself (see e.g. *Der Kleiner Pauly* s.v. 'Naevius'; R.G.Austin, *Aeneidos* L.I, xff.) it is most unlikely that he invented all the traits of this figure. As a conventional and patriarchal Roman Virgil could certainly not invent and create such an enterprising (*dux femina facti*) and 'emancipated' woman who, for all that, is pictured quite sympathetically. Such a figure would rather appeal to the Etruscans (and to Virgil in so far as he is a *vates Etruscus*). And it seems very likely that the Carthaginians resembled them in this respect since they worshiped the same kind of Mother-goddess as the Minoans and Etruscans (so J.Ferron in a publication forthcoming in *Muséon*)<sup>3</sup>. Huergon (*Daily Life of Etruscans*, ch.4, *in fine*) rightly related the 'privileged' position of women in Etruria to this worship: women were considered to be 'emanations' of the supreme deity, who may have been identical with Venus Erycina alias Astarte.

The Etruscan Aeneas legend, therefore, may well have contained his meeting with Dido. It is possible that this meeting resulted from the close relations between Etruria and Carthage referred to above. We may even believe that Virgil *Aen.* I 731-33 purposely made Dido say:

*Iuppiter (hospitibus nam te dare iura loquuntur)  
hunc laetum Tyriisque diem Troiaque profectis  
esse velis nostrosque huius meminisse minores!*

Which reminds us of Aristotle's statement quoted above. It would be yet another testimony to Virgil's Etruscan background. Or else the meeting at Carthage occurred already in the Etruscan version from before 525 B.C., and in that case it might well have shown up in the plastic representations of the legend. On a number of vases, or rather fragments of vases dating to that period 525-470 and presenting Aeneas carrying his father one or more female

<sup>3</sup> The tradition that Dido married her uncle Acherbas may reflect an archaic 'Mutterrecht' situation, in which the *avunculus* has certain privileges.

figures also accompany Aeneas (his father mostly carrying the Penates). As they are unnamed Schauenburg guesses the names of Venus, Creusa, or other 'unknown' women<sup>4</sup>. They do not seem to have any specific function. So, is it inconceivable that Dido is among them? It is precisely the image of Aeneas carrying his father (with the Penates) which was to characterize his being pious and venerable, such as to impress a woman like Dido. Probably we shall never know, but as those paintings do not seem to picture, or sum up, a special historical moment the guess of Dido is as fair as that of Venus or Creusa<sup>5</sup>. As a matter of fact, when Aeneas is introduced at Dido's court it is done with the words:

*rex erat Aeneas nobis, quo iustior alter  
nec pietate fuit* Aen.1. 544-45

In cursing Aeneas Dido herself says:

*infelix Dido, nunc te fata impia tangunt?  
tum decuit, cum sceptrum dabas. en dextra fidesque,  
quem secum patrios aiunt portare penates,  
quem subiisse umeris confectum aetate parentem!* Aen.4. 596-99

Such is the image of Aeneas which had made on Dido an unfortunate impression. Probably it belonged to the traditions about her encounter with him.

Copyright © 1989 A.W.J.Holleman

B.Boyaval (Lille): *P.IFAO II,1*

LCM 14.1 (Jan.1989), 7-9

Voici le texte de l'édition originale:

Βίων Νικ[άνορι χ]αίρειν. Ἐπει  
ὁ στρατηγός[ς κώμης Τ]εβτύνεως  
παρακέκληκεν ἡμ[ās] καταστήναι  
π[ρ]ὸς τῷ γραφίῳ τῇ[ς] κώμης  
φοροῦντας ἐνιαυτοῦ [ . . . ] πρότερον  
ἔφερεν ἧς ἴ κομισάμενος  
ταύτας παρ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὰς  
εἰθισμένας ἀναφοράς καὶ μὴ  
παρενοχλ[ή]σας αὐτόν. Ὁ γὰρ  
στρατηγός οὐ παρέργως ἔχ[ει]  
περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Ἐρρώσ[ο] Ἔτους ιγ τὸ καὶ ι Ἀθῦρ ιβ

J.Bingen, *Chron.Eg.XLVI* no.91 (1971), pp.129-132, en a proposé la réédition suivante:

Βίων Νικ[άνορι χ]αίρειν. Ἐπει  
ὁ στρατηγός[ς . . . . .]εβτύνεως  
παρακέκληκεν ἡμ[ās] καταστήσαι  
π[ρ]ὸς τῷ γραφίῳ τῇ[ς] κώμης  
φοροῦ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ χα[λκοῦ?] [(δραχμῶν).], πρότερον  
ἔφερεν χα[λκοῦ] (δραχμάς) Τ κομισάμενος  
ταύτας παρ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὰς

<sup>4</sup> K.Schauenburg, 'Aeneas und Rom', *Gymnasium* 67 (1960), 176-90 (ill.).

<sup>5</sup> If my guess be right it could explain the occurrence of a dog on three vases as 'le chien, si fréquent dans la religion phénicienne' R.Schilling, *La religion romaine de Vénus*, Paris 1954, 237. According to Justin 19.1.10 King Darius I of Persia dissuaded the Carthaginians from sacrificing and eating dogs. Dogs also occur on coins from Eryx and Segesta. After 2412 B.C. Segesta issued also coins with Aeneas carrying his father (Galinsky, 68, 72).

εἰθισμένως ἀναφορὰς, καὶ μὴ  
 παρενοχλ[ή]σ<η>ς αὐτόν. Ὁ γὰρ  
 στρατηγὸς οὐ παρέργως ἔχ[ει]  
 περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Ἐρρώσο (Ἔτους) ιγ δ καὶ ι Ἀθὺρ ιβ =

'Je ne reviens pas sur les raisons qui l'ont amené à corriger les l.3, 5, 12, et à rejeter la restitution de la l.2. Elles sont exposées *ibid.* pp.130-131.

Il subsiste encore beaucoup d'incertitudes dans cette lettre: "(. . .) les lacunes relativement brèves des l.2, 3 et 5, bien innocentes à première vue, grèvent en réalité toute l'interprétation du document d'une incertitude fondamentale: quel est le rôle du stratège dans tout cela? Qui prend en charge le *γραφεῖον*? Quel est le sujet et, partant, le sens de *ἔφερεν*? Sur quoi portent les échéances de 3000 dr. à la ligne 5?" (p.129).

Voici quelques remarques additionnelles:

Ligne 1 – La photo des P.IFAO révèle, dans la partie conservée de la marge droite, le démarrage d'un trait horizontal, analogue à celui qui traverse la marge gauche, à hauteur de la dernière ligne<sup>1</sup>: *επει* —————

Ligne 5 – L'édition originale avait fixé à trois lettres la lacune qui sépare les deux derniers mots. J.Bingen y a restitué une somme: "(. . .) trois à cinq lettres ont disparu (. . .). En fait, les lettres sont partiellement conservées, mais la photographie ne permet pas d'analyser les composantes de ces restes mutilés. In abstracto, on pourrait songer à relatif, mais on ne peut lire ni *δς* ni *δσου* ni *δσας*, et une telle construction nous priverait avec *ἔφερεν* de tout verbe principal pour le corps de la lettre, . . . alors qu'il nous en faudrait deux! Je crois reconnaître les restes du corps et de l'élément supérieur de l'abréviation *χα(λοῦ)*. Celle-ci serait suivie, si l'hypothèse est exacte, de l'indication d'une somme, probablement en milliers de drachmes, car il n'y a pas de place pour y placer (*ταλάντου*)α, par exemple" (p.131)

υ

Une photographie de 1967 (cliché J.Marthelet) donne: *ενιαυτου οκ[.] προτερον*

Comme une courte haste verticale subsistait encore à l'époque, sous la lettre en lacune à droite du *kappa*, la lecture la plus probable paraît être le relatif, avec attention au cas de l'antécédent: *φόρου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ οὗ κ[α]* πρότερον.

Ligne 9 – J.Bingen a rejeté la traduction de l'édition originale<sup>2</sup> et suggéré une explication: "Le texte que je soumets ici propose d'expliquer les participes de lignes 6 et 9, en supposant que le second est une faute (par répétition des nombreuses finales en -ας) pour *παρενοχλήσης*, défense qui expliquerait bien la fin de la lettre" (p.132). Dans le tracé extrêmement cursif du passage, on peut lire le subjonctif, semble-t-il: entre les deux *sigma* semi-circulaires<sup>3</sup>, on voit un petit 'chapeau' en forme d'angle aigu, pointé vers le haut, où rien n'interdit de lire un *ετα* rapide: *καὶ μὴ παρενοχλ[ή]σης*.

Pour remettre la phrase sur pied, J.Bingen a imaginé l'omission d'un verbe principal, devant le participe de la l.6 (p.132), soit: *<καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις> κομισάμενος . . . , καὶ μὴ παρενοχλήσης αὐτόν*. Mais le scribe aurait abouti au même sens avec la construction: *κομισάμενος . . . , μὴ παρενοχλήσης αὐτόν*. D'où ma tentation de supposer un mélange des deux constructions<sup>4</sup> et de placer la conjonction de coordination entre accolades, comme superfétatoire: *κομισάμενος . . . , {καὶ} μὴ παρενοχλήσης αὐτόν*.

L'édition originale notait aussi qu'une des difficultés de ce texte était d'identifier les

<sup>1</sup> Edition originale p.1

<sup>2</sup> "La négation *μὴ* n'encourage guère à traduire: 'sans l'avoir inquiété' (p.130).

<sup>3</sup> Le premier est un demi-cercle tracé d'un seul trait; le second, un demi-cercle interrompu cœa mi-parcours du trait, en deux segments.

<sup>4</sup> "Ce texte obscur se dérobe à toute construction régulière, soit parce qu'il est mal rédigé, soit parce qu'il n'est pas encore établi avec certitude, soit parce que ces deux raisons s'additionnent" (p.129).



individus désignés aux l.7 et 9 par les pronoms personnels. J.Bingen a fait remarquer "que le grec n'a jamais eu le souci de distinguer les troisièmes personnes, que ce soit du verbe ou du pronom personnel, qu'il utilise de front dans un même contexte", ensuite, que "si αὐτοῦ, à la l.11, est du masculin et désigne le même personnage, on ne peut y voir le stratège, Il y aurait donc un 'quatrième homme', solvable et susceptible, protégé par le stratège, un 'quatrième homme' dont on serait tenté de croire qu'il était cité à la ligne 2". L'anthroponyme [Papn]lebtynis est le plus probable, dès lors, pas seulement parce qu'un porteur de ce nom "apparaît dans un texte de la même collection, postérieur de quatorze mois seulement au nôtre (P.IFAO II, 4)" (p.131), mais aussi parce qu'il est le seul nom à pouvoir s'insérer ici. J.Bingen, imaginant un schéma préposition + nom, a retenu deux possibilités<sup>5</sup>, mais une troisième me paraît donner un sens plus satisfaisant<sup>6</sup>: *παρὰ Παπν]εβτύνεως*.

Je propose donc, sous réserves, une nouvelle version de ce texte:

Βίων Νικ[άνορι χ]αιρεῖν. Ἐπεὶ  
ὁ στρατηγός[ς παρὰ Παπν]εβτύνεως  
παρακέκληκεν ἡμ[ᾶς] καταστήσαι  
π[ρ]ὸς τῷ γραφίῳ τῇ[ς] κῆμης  
5 φόρου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ οὐ κ[ᾶ] πρότερον  
ἔφερεν χα[λκοῦ] (δραχμῶν)<sup>7</sup> Ἦ, κομισάμενος  
ταύτας παρ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὰς  
εἰθισμένας ἀναφοράς, (καὶ) μὴ  
παρενοχλ[ή]σης αὐτόν. Ὁ γὰρ  
περὶ αὐτοῦ.  
Ἐρρώσο (Ἔτους) ιγ δ καὶ ι Ἀθύρ ιβ =

Copyright © 1989 B.Boyaval

J. A. Barsby (Otago): Terence and the Shipwrecked Lover

LCM 14.1 (Jan.1989) 9-10

In her useful book *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto, 1972) Elaine Fantham makes the valid point that, while the nucleus of what she calls the more baroque love imagery of lyric and elegy is found in Terence, there are some interesting exceptions. The 'imagery of *seruitium* to the mistress, of the *foedus* as a sanctified equivalent of marriage, and of the *furtum* are alien to the situation and values of Terence's characters: the arrows of the love-god and his wounds...seem to have been rejected by Terence' (pp.90f).

She then goes on to claim: 'Similarly the lover's shipwreck on the seas of passion, found only once in Plautus (*Cist.*221), is absent from Terence, although developed elaborately in Elegy' (p.91), which repeats what she has said earlier in the same chapter: 'Of the imagery found in both Menander and Plautus' Menander-plays, shipwreck (*Men. fr.*656 and *Cist.*221) is absent from Terence' (p.85).

The Menander and Plautus examples are interesting ones. The speaker of the Menander fragment is evidently a young man suffering from the pains of love (*adulescens repentino amore incensus adloquitur spectatores*: Körte). He is looking for an image to describe his situation, contrasting it to a storm at sea where at least you can hold on to a bit of wreckage:

... ναυαγίου δ' ἂν ἐπιλάβοι, ἐγὼ δ' ἄπαξ  
ἀψάμενός εἰμι καὶ φιλήσας ἐν βυθῷ.

In the context ἐν βυθῷ must bear a nautical meaning ('at the bottom of the sea', i.e.

<sup>5</sup> [Διὰ Παπν]εβτύνεως, [ὑπὲρ Παπν]εβτύνεως.

<sup>6</sup> "(...) le stratège nous a prié de la part de Papnebtynis etc."

<sup>7</sup> Je préfère un génitif d'évaluation, ici.

'drowned'): in other words the young man is both rejecting the shipwreck as an image of the lover's experience and at the same time using something very similar. In Plautus by contrast the shipwreck image is directly applied to love. The *adulescens* Alcesimarchus is complaining in a soliloquy of how Amor treats him, dealing with him like the sea:

*maritumis moribus mecum experitur;  
ita meum frangit amantem animum;  
neque, nisi quia miser non eo pessum,  
mihi ulla abest perdito perimities,*

where in the context the word *frangit* suggests *naufragium* and the *eo pessum* of the following line takes on the meaning 'go to the bottom of the sea' (for examples of *pessum* in nautical contexts see OLD s.v.).

It is indeed interesting that this image is so rare in New Comedy and its Roman adapters, though we cannot of course guarantee that further examples will not turn up in the papyri of Greek comedy. But, as far as Terence is concerned, Fantham seems to do less than justice to Ter. *Eun.* 1037f:

CH. *tum autem Phaedriae*

*meo fratri gaudeo esse amorem omnem in tranquillo,*

where the obvious implication of *in tranquillo* is 'after a storm', with reference to Phaedria's treatment by Thais. Donatus (ad loc.) has no doubt that a nautical image is intended:

*bene 'in tranquillo', quia mari et tempestatibus nimia amicae mobilitas  
et instabilitas comparatur,*

and he goes on to refer to one of the best known treatments of the image as applied to love, Horace's *Pyrrha* ode (1.5). Fabia in his commentary accepts the metaphor as nautical ('*métaphore usuelle empruntée à la navigation*'), comparing Pl. *Merc.* 890f. (*Quid si mi animus fluctuat? | Ego istum in tranquillo quieto tuto sistam*) and '*métaphores analogues*' at *And.* 480 (*in portu*) and 845 (*in uado*). English translators have generally followed suit (Sargeaunt: 'his ship's in calm water'; Radice: 'Phaedria's love affair has weathered its storms'), though Marouzeau changes the image (*en bonne voie*) and Due prefers the non-committal 'can now enjoy an undisturbed love affair' ('*kan nyde en uforstyrret kærlighedslykke*').

Fantham does include in her general discussion of wind and storm metaphors (pp. 19-26) the variant reading of Ter. *Ph.* 689

*huic mandes, qui ad scopulum e tranquillo auferat,*

where the *ad scopulum* seems to confirm that the natural reference of *tranquillum* in these phrases is to a calm at sea. But *Eun.* 1038 rates a mention only in a footnote (p. 23), where she makes it clear that she is unwilling to allow any specific imagery to *tranquillum* alone. And, as far as *Eun.* 1038 is concerned, she has an ally in OLD, s.v. *tranquillum*, which includes the passage not in its first category ('Calm weather or calm, usu. w. ref. to the sea'), where some figurative uses of the word do find a home, but in its second ('calm state of mind or affairs').

It is always difficult to decide, at this distance in time, how live any given metaphor in Latin literature is. It is also true that a reference to a calm is not in itself a reference to a shipwreck, and that Phaedria's love affair in the *Eunuch* is not actually described as tempestuous. But the image is there by implication, and, granted its explicit occurrence in Menander and Plautus, it seems arbitrary to deny it to Terence.

Review: C.J.Tuplin (Liverpool)

LCM 14.1 (Jan.1989), 11-12

Russell Meiggs & David Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century B.C.*, revised edition, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988. Pp.xx + 317. Cloth, £35. ISBN 0 19 814266 8

What this volume needs is not so much a review as a wealth warning. I have no doubt that the relevant Clarendon Press advertising material makes the matter reasonably clear. Nonetheless my most urgent task must be that of indicating what precisely is meant by the phrase 'Revised Edition'. The answer is (a) some more (unidentified) 'tidying up of the main text' (p.5) of the sort already done in 1971 and 1975 reprints, (b) five and a half pages of Addenda, and (c) a three page concordance with *IG i<sup>3</sup>*, P.Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca I* Berlin 1983), C.W.Fornara, *Translated Documents of Greece and Rome I: Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War* (Cambridge 1983) ['an essential companion' (p.v) to the present volume and by the same token to any serious study of Greece before 404] and *SEG* xxvi-xxxiii. For this you pay £35.

It is, of course, a great bonus if you don't yet have a copy of Meiggs & Lewis (hereafter ML), and one can well understand that the publishers and editors should have come to feel that simply to go on reprinting a 20 year old handbook in an area as changeable as epigraphy is not quite respectable. On the other hand, what is now provided is just about the minimum required to regain respectability, and if you do already possess ML, you would be well advised to try to borrow a copy of the revised version and, at the expense of maybe an hour's perusal and note-taking, save yourself the money for some purchase which represents better value. I say 'try to borrow a copy' because it may not be easy. If my advice is widely taken there will be few private copies to be found in the hands of one's colleagues. Those of us lucky enough to get review copies are going to become very popular. The same goes for colleagues with an unusually nonchalant attitude to cash and newcomers to the business kitting themselves out with the necessary tools of the trade (in most universities this will practically mean the occasional postgraduate, since I suspect that the sale of ML among provincial undergraduates is not great).

There is, of course, the alternative of the university or school library. Or is there? These are hard times even for libraries less eccentrically run than the one in Liverpool. Should we be asking even an institution to spend £35 for 8 1/2 pages of new text? I suspect not, especially since the Addenda add little of substance to what is already in the public domain.

The principal merit of ML is its provision of succinct but authoritative assessments of the documents and their problems. But, as the Preface says, the aim of the revision is simply to 'single out major treatments of whole inscriptions, major changes in the nature of the evidence, and more important references not yet included in *SEG*', so, although there is a great deal of implicit judgement about the potential heuristic significance of other scholars' contributions, the Addenda offer few explicit judgements by the editors about the texts. 10 may need to be downdated. Amandry, *BCH* 102 (1978), 582f. has refuted ML's position on 25. 30.31 should read ἐπὶ Δυνάμει not ἐπὶ δυνάμει. 33 is probably not the exceptional record of a single tribe and the singular ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ does not bear the weight of inference ML tried to put upon it. The dynast of 33 is probably Gergis and line 4 should start [ἐρ]γον. On 56 and 67 bis see below.

Of the 95 items in ML, 62 do receive some sort of gloss, sometimes nothing more than e.g. '49. Malkin, *Chiron* xiv (1984) 43-8 discusses the τεμένη' or '90. Walbank, *Proxenes* no.87 with photograph'. The amount of bibliographical updating is, of course, strictly limited, given the guide lines quoted above. But room should certainly have been found for the characteristically bold and original views of N.G.L.Hammond, *JHS* 102 (1982), 75ff. (and cf. id., *Phoenix* 40 (1986), 143f.) about 23 (the Themistocles Decree), even if twenty years' worth of comment on this contentious text is otherwise passed over in silence.

Three pieces of new text are included. The Sparta-Erxadieis treaty (*SEG* xxvi 461 etc.) is the only one to get its own slot in the numbered sequence (as '67 bis'); it is printed without textual commentary and with 10 1/2 lines of comment (a date '[not] earlier than . . . 426' is accepted. Readers of *LCM* will recall some spirited discussion of this text soon after its *editio princeps* from Dr Cartledge (*LCM* 1.7 [Jul.1976], 87-92, & 3.7 [Jul.1978], 87-92) and Dr Kelly (*ibid.* 3.5 [May 1978], 1333-141), though these are not mentioned here. Elsewhere we get (*sub* 34) the new text connecting the Egyptian rebel Inaros and the Samians (*Ath.Mitt.* 87 [1972], 153f.); and the new restoration of *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 65.20-29, proving that the Herakleides of 70 came from Klazomenai, is printed out in full – though my own feeling is that the space might have been better used in various ways, e.g. to double the amount of comment on the Erxadieis treaty or to specify the new details of Tribute Lists I (of which part was actually printed in the otherwise purely descriptive 39) and II or explain the nature of A.P.Bridges' (*JHS* 100 [1981], 185f.) 'better arrangement' of fragments *b* and *d* of 56 or even to squeeze in some other entirely new text, such as the one published by P.Siewert, *Olympia-Bericht* 10 (1981), 228ff., which is alleged to refer to a judgement by the Olympic authorities against the Thessalians and Thebans for having participated in the destruction of Thespieae and Athens during the Olympic truce of 480.

No publication such as the present one would be complete without references to as yet unpublished items. Of the notoriously controversial Persian War epigrams (26) we learn that the editors have heard of a block 'apparently related to this text, which may totally change our ideas of this monument'. One understands their desire not to keep this leak to themselves, yet the resulting statement is merely tantalizing. At the very least it would be useful for it to be made clear (a) who is the source of their information, (b) how close that source is to the person(s) who has/have the study and publication concession on the item in question, and (c) whether it is the case that the source has actually reported more details but the editors feel constrained by etiquette from revealing them. The effect in any case will for the moment be to dissuade outsiders from wasting any intellectual effort on 26, but it would be nice to know on what sort of authority this temporary no entry sign is being erected. The other unpublished item is more specific: a new fragment 67 apparently refers to Aeginetan exiles and therefore suggests that a Peloponnesian War date is after all right for the Spartan War-fund text which Lewis had wanted to place in the early fourth century. (By contrast nothing is said of the Eteokarpathian decree printed in M.N.Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* II no.110 as an early fourth century text but now commonly regarded as belonging in the later fifth century. Had this view prevailed 20 years ago, the document would have had a claim to inclusion in *ML* and ought surely to be mentioned now).

Copyright © 1988 C.J.Tuplin

Review: **Elizabeth Henry** (Blackburn)

*LCM* 14.1 (Jan.1989), 12-13

*L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae* ed. O.Zweierlein. Oxford Classical Texts, 1986. Pp.xxiv + 483. Cloth, £18.95. ISBN 0-19-814657-4

The imperfections of the surviving MSS for Seneca's plays, and the complexity of their stemma, have long challenged editors (and defeated many of them). When R.H.Philp published his very full and lucid account of the MSS tradition (*CQ* 1968) as it then stood, he spoke of the need for an acceptable text as 'dire'. Shortly after Philp wrote his article, Giardina's text brought considerable mitigation of this direness; but Giardina had not collated all the E-branch MSS (he had to rely heavily on Leo), and he was working before the discovery by A.P.MacGregor of the valuable Paris MS known as T. The excerpts made by Helinandus of Froidmont (v. E.R.Smits, *Mnem.* 1983) were also unknown to Giardina, but these (although they antedate any complete A codex) would evidently have made little difference to his text. Zweierlein has scrutinised Helinandus and has drawn from him *n e unam quidem lectionem (ineptiis neglectis)*.

*ineptias negligere* is one of the leading principles that Z. has followed to produce an Apparatus Criticus so all-embracing as this one is, and yet so far from ponderous. Senecan scholars have been aware, for at least fifteen years, that he was engaged on this ambitious project; in 1980 Elaine Fantham spoke of the opus as a 'Herculean achievement, still in the future'. The Handlist of MSS now published by MacGregor in *ANRW* 32:2 reveals the extent of the material. But Fantham was speaking of the nature of the work as well as its scale.

What was to be distinctive in Z.'s editing was already quite clear when Fantham wrote, from the series of articles in *Würz.Jbb.* (1976-7-8-9, also now 1980) which present specific comment on collections of corrupt or possibly interpolated passages in the plays. The breadth of reference in Z.'s citations here is no less remarkable than his precision and subtlety. These articles have been followed by two books of major importance, the *Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Angabe . . .* (1983), which surveys the whole MSS tradition and the problems of establishing the text, and the systematic *Kritischer Kommentar* on the tragedies themselves. The work done in these two volumes has now been crowned by the present text, far superior to any previously published. It can only be this text that will (as Fitch's *HF* and Boyle's *Phaedra* have already demonstrated) provide the starting-point and the yardstick for all future editions of individual plays.

The merits of Z.'s text are manifold. His meticulousness in collation goes without saying, also his knowledge of earlier editions and critics. His short Preface outlines the history of the text, and gives more bibliographical information than has been usual for *OCT*s, so that names in the Apparatus Criticus that may be unfamiliar can usefully be traced. Mere varieties of orthography or accident are relegated to an Appendix, but the conciseness of the App.Crit. reveals a confident discrimination based on literary judgement as well as erudition. Surprisingly, Z. includes in his App.Crit. comparative passages which may have influenced his choice of reading; so on *Tro.*430 *Stygis profundae* he corrects the MSS *profunde* or *-ii* or *-i* and cites *Oed.*401 *profundae claustra Stygis*. On *Tro.*457 even the *Octavia* ('*falso Senecae adscripta*') is cited for the use of *excutio* of panic awakening a sleeper.

Sometimes such a citation is clearly not in support of a choice of reading, but illuminates the author's thought or imagery. So *Ag.*657 *telum Pyrrhi vix exiguo sanguine tingui* is cited on *Tro.*50, where Z. prefers *ensis siccus* (E) rather than *tinctus* (A) for the same moment of Priam's death. The idea goes back to Ovid (*Met.*VII.315 *exiguo maculavit sanguine ferrum*) as Z. has shown in his *Krit.Komm.*

Comparative quotation is not confined to Seneca and the 'pseudo-Senecan' plays. We have Quintilian presenting *Med.*453 as an example of a question asked *invidiae gratia*, and Augustine quoting *Phd.*195-6. Jerome's *Life of Malchus* parallels *Tro.*510-12, and Guido de Bazochis' reference to *HF* 849-50 is included from his *Apologia contra maledicos*. All this is much more than we expect in any *Oxford Text*. At the same time Z. occasionally introduces conjectures of his own which are brilliantly simple and bold: *impiger* for MSS *piger* at *Thy.*736, for example (of the insatiably ravaging lion to whom Atreus is compared; the case for this reading is argued in the *Krit.Komm.* with supporting passages from Horace and Ovid; it has already been accepted in Tarrant's *Thyestes*). Cautious preferences are less frequent for Z.; he rather disappointingly follows E to read *salsa . . . mola* at *Thy.*688 (Tarrant also) instead of the attention-catching *falso* (A). *fusa* (T) is, perhaps justifiably, not mentioned. At *HO* 1595 *mundus sonat ecce caecum* introduces a forceful conjecture with *caecum* where others have merely repeated *maeret* from the next line or taken limp expedients such as *summus* (Ascensius, cited in Z.'s preface though not at this point admitted to the App.Crit.).

In the excision of lines considered inauthentic, Z. has become less ruthless over the years of his Senecan study – a change noted as early as 1984 by Margarethe Billerbeck in her review of Fantham's *Troades* (*Phoneix*, p.290). In colometry also this text is often more conservative than Z. was prepared to be in the *Prolegomena*. The text has a Conspectus Metrorum with full details of the few polymetric cantica.

Copyright © 1989 Elizabeth Henry

Review discussion: **J.N.Adams** (Manchester)

LCM 14.1 (Jan.1989), 14-16

Roger Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance* (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 8, Liverpool 1982), pp. xii + 322. £25. ISBN 0-905205-12-X.

### I The 'two-norm' theory

Wright argues against the view that in the Medieval period before the Carolingian revival of learning a form of Latin continued to be spoken by an educated minority, while the majority spoke evolved forms of the vernacular. Before the revival Latin did not exist; everyone spoke the vernacular. Because of the conservatism of writing, that vernacular when put into written form looked like Latin. In other words, 'Pre-reform Medieval Latin was a written form of the vernacular, different in kind from post-reform Medieval Latin, which was in theory a separate language' (53 f.). W. repeatedly talks of Medieval Latin as an 'invention' of the Carolingian revival: e.g. 'The common admission that only a very few men of the time "knew Latin" needs to be revised into a firm recognition that nobody of that time "knew Latin", neither imperial vernacular nor the artificial language used since the twelfth-century Renaissance: Latin as we know it now had not yet been invented' (77; cf. ix, 52, 103). He was thinking here of the Latinate pronunciation of Latin. At one point (167) W. transcribes a text, apparently written in Latin, into phonetic script, to show how it might have sounded in vernacular pronunciation (that of León). Pronounced with vernacular phonetics, such a text apparently becomes recognisable as the vernacular, despite its Latinate appearance to us (171 '... there is no reason to suppose that this reading would not have sounded like the vernacular: a legal style, recognizably, but a style of Old Leonese rather than a separate language used by the educated').

It is entirely reasonable to say (44) that 'the idea that any group of people could resist phonetic changes that were generally affecting the rest of the community, for a thousand years or more, is difficult to take seriously'. The view that in, say, the seventh century only the vernacular was spoken is not new (see T. Janson, *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin*, Stockholm 1979, 13), but it is certainly worth investigating in detail. W.'s book is wide-ranging and argumentative. His main thesis is convincing, as is a good deal else in the book. But W. is not free from faults. He oversimplifies the views of modern scholars, sometimes lumping them together without adequate documentation. He misrepresents or misunderstands some of the Latin evidence he uses, notably that from grammarians. And he considers an inadequate number and variety of Medieval texts.

In this review I shall concern myself largely with the first part of the book (on the pre-Carolingian period and on Carolingian France); I do not feel competent to judge the last two chapters (on Spain 711-1250).

W. would have us believe that the traditional view is that Latin and early Romance 'coexisted as *spoken* languages during the centuries between the end of the Roman Empire and the twelfth-century Renaissance' (1, my italics). This he calls the 'two-norm' theory. Some dozen modern scholars are quoted (1-3) as holding this view. I have not checked most of the passages in context, but it is by no means clear even from the quotations that all of these scholars held exactly the opinion attributed to them. It is surprising to find D.Norberg, for instance, included in W.'s list. He is criticised (2) for believing that pre-Carolingian Latin and the vernacular were 'conceptually distinguishable'. I am not convinced that, even if Norberg held such a belief (which is doubtful: see below), it would be the same as believing that Latin continued to be *spoken* alongside the vernacular before the revival. Certainly a belief that Latin was spoken by an educated minority, while the masses spoke the vernacular, implies a belief in two 'conceptually distinct' languages. But conversely a belief that Latin and the vernacular were conceptually distinct in the seventh century would not imply any belief that Latin persisted as a spoken language, with archaic phonetics; one might hold that it continued as a learned written language, used only by those who had received instruction in its writing.

In any case Norberg acknowledges on the very page cited by W. that before the ninth

century Latin and the vernacular were not conceived as separate languages (*Manuel pratique de latin médiéval*, Paris 1968, 28 f.): 'les contemporains ne pouvaient pas se rendre compte de l'évolution linguistique à laquelle ils participaient ni en analyser les conséquences. Ce n'est qu'au début du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle qu'on s'est aperçu au nord de la Gaule que la différence entre la langue écrite et la langue parlée était devenue si grande que la langue écrite n'était plus comprise par qui ne l'avait pas étudiée'.

W. also misrepresents the views of E.Löfstedt, whose adherence to the 'two-norm' theory is supposedly demonstrated by the following quotation from *Late Latin*, Oslo 1959, 3: 'There could be no sharper contrast than that between the conservative character of officialdom's language and the tendencies of popular speech'. W. does not say anything about the context from which this quotation comes. Löfstedt sets out to counter a view that official Merovingian documents were written as the mass of the population in Gaul spoke. By 'language' he means 'register'. The sentence is not even about Latin as such, but is a generalisation about officialese vis-à-vis popular speech in any language. If W. had wished to give an accurate account of Löfstedt's views he might have summarised chapter IV ('Medieval Latin') of the same book.

W. has not done justice to the variety of modern opinion about the nature of Medieval Latin. Many of the scholars he refers to are Romance philologists. Latinists, we are told, have often not appreciated how widespread the evolution of Latin was; they have tended to assume that 'there was very little change in speech from the first century to the seventh' (46). On Medieval Latin no mention is made of C. Mohrmann's article '*Le dualisme de la latinité médiévale*', *REL* 29 (1951), 330ff., where the views of earlier scholars who attempted to characterise Medieval Latin are summarised. Mohrmann's own conception of Medieval Latin is stated on p. 338: '*le latin médiéval est une langue vivante sans être la langue d'une communauté ethnique. C'est la langue de communication d'une élite, et elle est fondée sur une tradition religieuse et culturelle. Comme langue d'une élite, le latin médiéval revêt un caractère plutôt savant, et comme langue savante, transmise par l'école, il est en premier lieu écrite et secondairement langue parlée*'. Take away '*et secondairement langue parlée*' and you have a view of Medieval Latin which is probably widely held, and is close to W.'s own. Whereas to Mohrmann Medieval Latin was primarily a learned written *language* transmitted by the schools, to W. it was a learned *register* or style of the vernacular (see 171). One would like to have had more recognition from W. of the existence of the type of opinion expressed by Mohrmann (see however 77), and a full explanation of why a piece of learned seventh or eighth century prose should be regarded as simply a register of the vernacular.

## II 'Learned forms'

W. has a useful discussion of learned, 'unevolved' forms passing into the Romance languages (4ff.). These are said (5) to have been used to support the existence before the Carolingian period of a Latinate way of speaking alongside the evolved vernacular. W. is able to point out some inadequacies in the way in which learned forms have been identified, and some illogicalities in the assumptions made by those who have discussed the subject.

As one way of accounting for these unevolved forms in early Romance, W. has recourse to the theory of 'lexical diffusion', which is most accessible to classicists in T. Janson's study of vowel weakening in early Latin (see *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin*, 46ff., especially 55f.). Proponents of this theory have questioned the traditional view of sound change as operating inexorably at the same time in every relevant word (see W. 17). For reasons which are rarely clear, some words, in W.'s phraseology, 'jump to the head of the queue', whereas others hang back and are either partially affected, or not affected at all by the time the change ceases to operate. Vowel weakening in Latin affected some verbal roots in their compound forms totally, others partially, still others not at all. W. states (18) that 'with regard to our problem of phonetically retarded "learnéd" words that seem to have existed in

speech before the Carolingian reforms, lexical diffusion has permitted us to suggest that these words might merely be words that were at the end of the queue, which the change never reached'. In much of the rest of the chapter he discusses why some words might have hung back, with some case studies.

A few further cases studies could be cited which are relevant to the issue. First, the history of *quietus* (on which see B. Löfstedt, *NM* 80 (1979), 385f.). The popular form shows loss of the *i* before the accent (*quiētus* > *quetus* > OFr. *coi*, etc.). But *quietus* also survives as Fr. *quitte* 'quits, free of obligations or debt', which apparently reflects *quiētus*, showing a shift of the accent to counter the tendency for the *i* to be lost (see E. Lerch, *ZRPh* 58 (1938), 648). In this sense *quietus* was a legal term, attested in legal writings well before the Carolingian revival. The non-popular pronunciation will have been used by lawyers as a means of distinguishing their technical use from the general sense of the word (cf. W. 23ff.). There is no suggestion that lawyers spoke with an archaic phonetic system; the expected phonetic development in this one item was countered in the register of lawyers as a means of avoiding polysemy. Secondly, V. Väänänen's discussion ('*Latin, langue parlée et langue écrite: réactions et régressions*', in *Actes du XReR Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, Strasbourg 1962, II, Paris 1965, 417-425, = id., *Recherches et récréations latino-romanes*, Naples 1981, 61ff., which version I cite here) of certain developments in the pronunciation of *dies*. This word was subject to palatalisation/assibilisation not only in oblique-case forms such as *diebus*, where the *i* did not bear the stress (*debus*, *zebus*, for *dy-*, *dz-*), but also in forms in which the *i* was stressed (*des*, *zes* for *dies*: see Väänänen 63). *De* for *die* is attested as early as the first century A.D., in one of the legal tablets from Murecine which are still being edited. Yet the Romance forms (It. *di*, OFr., Prov. *di*, etc.; cf. *lundi*) reflect a form with an accented vocalic *i*, '*qui, par surcroît, a subi une fermeture. . . C'est grâce à une réaction <<thérapeutique>> . . . que la prononciation éprouvée comme vicieuse a été contrariée, puis effacée; ce qui a restitué l'ancien état, exagérant même la position accentuée de la voyelle menacée*' (Väänänen 63). *Dies* did not simply 'go to the end of the queue'. It early suffered phonetic change, but the old form was reinstated by a learned reaction, presumably instigated by speakers who sought to resist palatalisation under the accent (cf. W. 60). The restored learned pronunciation does not postdate the Carolingian reforms, but is confirmed by a passage of the fifth (or early sixth) century grammarian Pompeius (*GL* V.286.20f.) which will be discussed below. Pompeius accepts as normal the pronunciation *Titsus* for *Titius*, but on *dies* comments: '*ecce dies habet post se uocalem; debemus dicere d<z>es, sed non dicimus*'. 'Learned reaction' is one factor which can in a haphazard way cause old pronunciations to linger alongside the evolved. In any community there are probably monitors of what they see as the degeneration of their language, people who are capable of using spelling pronunciations. In the late Republic, for example, there seems to have been a tendency to restore the *n* which had early been lost before *s* in words such as *consul* (*cosul*, *cos.*) (see W.S. Allen, *Vox Latina*, Cambridge 1965, 28f.).

*To be continued.*

Copyright © 1989 J.N.Adams

